



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,942	01/13/2004	Tamer A. Elbatt	GP-303789 (2760/118)	3295

General Motors Corporation
Legal Staff, Mail Code 482-C23-B21
300 Renaissance Center
P.O. Box 300
Detroit, MI 48265-3000

EXAMINER

HUYNH, NAM TRUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/756,942	Applicant(s) ELBATT ET AL.	
	Examiner Nam Huynh	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8, 9, 12-15, 17 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 7, 10, 11, 16, 18 and 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/13/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 12, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sholander et al. (US 7,177,295).

Sholander et al. discloses a method for selecting a route within a wireless ad-hoc routing protocol (abstract). In the scope of the invention, a data packet originates at a source node and terminates at a destination node. A routing zone, which may be dynamic and can change as nodes are added to or removed from the network or can be set by a predetermined number of hops from the source node is defined or determined for the source node (identifying each neighbor node), is defined for the source node (column 7, lines 7-10). If the destination node is within the routing zone of the source node, the communication link is established using a route generated by the proactive routing protocol (proactive border node broadcast protocol). If the destination is outside the routing zone, the communication link is established using a reactive routing protocol (on-demand border node broadcast protocol) by generating a route request that is sent

Art Unit: 2617

to each border node, which in turn broadcasts the request outside the routing zone to locate the destination node (columns 4, 5, lines 59-67, 1-8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 2-5, 8, 9, 13-15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sholander et al. (US 7,177,295) in view of Ahmed et al. (US 7,006,453).

A. Regarding claims 2 and 13, Sholander et al. discloses the limitations set forth in claim 1, but does not explicitly disclose that the source node polls each neighbor node for position information and generates a table identifying the location of each neighbor node. Ahmed et al. discloses a geometry-based routing protocol (GRP) that is used to route traffic from a source node to a destination node (abstract). In the scope of the invention, each node periodically transmits to its direct neighbors its GPS location

Art Unit: 2617

information (position information/geographic location) and applies computational geometry (geometric criteria) to the collected GPS information to select those surrounding nodes that facilitate geometric routing and sets up point-to-point links with the selected nodes and forms a neighbor table (column 6, lines 55-59). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Sholander et al. to allow the source node to receive position information from its neighbors, as taught by Ahmed et al., in order to route data as a function of the distance to the location of a destination node. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the greater the distance to the destination node, the more resources are required for transmission. Therefore by adding this capability system resources are saved because a source node is able to identify the closest node in its local topology (border node) to the destination node.

B. Regarding claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 14, 15, and 17, Ahmed et al. discloses that if a destination node (node 205) is not part of the local topology for a source node (node 105), the source node performs the GRP to identify the closest node in its local topology (selecting a border node based on geographic location and geometric criteria). Once the node closest to the destination node is identified, the source node sends the packet to this particular node (broadcasting the information from the source node), which then performs the GRA (invoking a border node broadcast protocol at the border node/destination query message) using its local topology table to route the data to the destination node (column 5, lines 5-31).

C. Regarding claim 5, the routing zone of Sholander et al. is not limited to the number of hops from the source node and therefore is selectable.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 6, 7, 10, 11, 16, 18, and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hamdi et al. (US 2004/0203380)

Zhang et al. (US 2004/0246901)

Krishnamurthy et al. (US 6,990,075)

Saleh et al. (US 2001/0033548)

Payton et al. (US 7,113,746)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nam Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-5970.


The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m.-5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NTH
3/21/07


GEORGE ENG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER